

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/811,503	03/26/2004	William B. Rademaker	RADW122601	8914	
26389 7590 12/27/2006 CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347			EXAMINER		
			MOHANDESI, JILA M		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3728	- <del></del>	
	-	·			
•			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/27/2006	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/811,503	RADEMAKER, WILLIAM B.
Examiner	Art Unit
Jila M. Mohandesi	3728

	Jila M. Mohandesi	3728				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 13 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31: or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or to TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 76	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing day	of the fee. The appropri nally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)). to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	acalisa			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below):	000000			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);	•				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re-	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil vided below or appended.	l be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
3.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and			
D. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a ).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowar	nce because:			
12. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
<ol> <li>Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</li> </ol>		7				
		de la				
		Jila M Mohandesi				
		Primary Examiner				

Continuation of 13. Other: The newly submitted claims were not previously considered, therefore requiring further review and/or search. Applicant's arguments filed 12/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the cited references, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the references teach the desirability of providing a personal cleaning device carried by a product container that is one of the same goals of the other references, thereby meeting reasons/suggestion to combine when taken as a whole with the other references before one.